The 2,300 'days' of Daniel and the "daily"

Part Two in a series of articles on the *Little Horn of Daniel 8, and the Leopard-like beast of Revelation 13.*

Daniel 8:8 informs us that at the death of the he-goat (i.e Alexander the Great), his kingdom was divided among his generals. Verse 9 informs us that out of one of these three kingdoms would come a `little horn':

Daniel 8:9 - And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.

This is of course the verse which has proven to be most problematic for Seventh-Day Adventists; for the plain sense of the text indicates that the Papacy came out of *Greece,* instead of pagan Rome, as already established in Daniel ch. 7. This leads us with a problem - is the `little horn' of Daniel ch. 8 an entirely *different* power to that of Daniel ch. 7 - as was first suggested by Hippolytus some 1,900 years ago, or is it the *same power,* whose identifying attributes are expressed in a different sense, than is delineated in chapter 7; for if our Lord were to inform us of *exactly* the same attributes in chapter 8, then would this not be just a little redundant of Him, and rather illogical?

The 2,300 `days' of Daniel

There are some who will say that `No, what you are saying is not correct - our greatest difficulty in exegesis has always been Daniel 8:14, which gives us the beginning point of the 2,300 days - and whether or not this should be identified as 1,150 literal days, or 2,300 calendar years.' My answer to this, is that this is a *secondary* issue, and results from Antiochus *first* being established with the identification of the `little horn' of Dan. 8, from which a theology must *then* be constructed in order for the rest of the text to fit this thesis. This is precisely what *some* translators have done when commenting on the 2,300 `days' of Daniel, where in verse 14, a literal translation for *day,* is `*ereb-boqer*',  which translates to `*evening-mornings*':

`lit., *mornings and evenings,* specified in connection with the morning and evening

sacrifice. Cf. Genesis 1. 5. Six years and 110 days. This includes not only the three and a half years during which the daily sacrifice was forbidden by Antiochus (Josephus, B. J. 1. 1. sec. 1), but the whole series of events whereby it was practically interrupted . . .' *(`Commentary on the Old and New Testaments', Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, S.S Scranton and Co., New York, 1873, p. 638.)*

The expositors of *this* commentary attempted to shore up their position on Antiochus, *by changing the literal translation of the text!* Fortunately, in later translations of the Bible the word `days' in Daniel 8:14 is translated with a correct exegesis, which is `*evening-mornings*'. This is important, as a correct rendition of the two phrases `morning and evening' and `evening and morning' is critical to our understanding of the precise meaning of the text at hand! Daniel 8:14 was simply referring to days, and nothing else, as the phrase `*evenings and mornings*' has nothing to do with sacrifice in a linguistic sense - as suggested by the Bible commentary above. Instead, it refers to chronological time and more specifically 2300 `*evenings mornings*; in precisely the same sense of Genesis 1:5, where we are told *that `the evening and the morning were the first day.'* For if the daily sacrifice of young male rams `*morning and evening*' was intended - then the original Hebrew would read `*boqer*' ( morning) `*ereb*' (evenings), and the practice which is used by Futurists in splitting the 2,300 `day' into two periods of daily sacrifice, so that the time period becomes 1,150 literal days might well be justified. As it stands, there is none. This is further clarified by verses 26-27:

`And the vision of the *evening and the morning* which was told is true: wherefore shut you up the vision; for it shall be for many days. And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.' *(Daniel 8:26-27)*

In this instance, the phrase `*evenings and mornings*' is used, instead of `*days*' in precisely the same syntax as Daniel 8:14, and therefore has precisely the same meaning - *which is literal days; which there for gives weight to Daniel 8:14, by indicating that the length of the vision is 2,300 days, or (according to the day/year principle in prophecy) - calendar years, and has nothing to do with 2,300 literal sacrifices, morning and evening!* It also stands to reason that if the vision was to only last for 1150 literal days (just over six years), as detractors assume, then it would be difficult to understand *why* Daniel fainted, and was also ill `for certain days', as he was astonished by the *length* of the vision! (Daniel 8:27) It wasn't because of the events contained *in* the vision, as he confesses that he didn't understand it! Logically, the only other reason was because of the length of it!

The "daily" of Daniel 8:11,12,13, 11:31 and 12:11

In the Book of Daniel, the word `daily' is always translated `*ta hamid*'. The prefix `*ta*' means `*the*' and is always used in conjunction with `*hamid*'; which means `*daily*'. If you look at any concordance, you will always find that the concordance reads as such; `*the daily [sacrifice]*' ; which indicates that the word `*sacrifice*' is not native to the text, but is instead a supplied word. Ellen White also received precisely the same information while in vision:

“I saw in relation to the ‘daily,’ Daniel 8:12, that the word ‘sacrifice’ was supplied by man’s wisdom and does not belong to the text; and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment-hour cry.” *(`Early Writings', p. 74.)*

Now, while I am no student of Hebrew, the only times in which `*ha tamid* is used, is in the Book of Daniel, where it refers to the continual burnt offering; very much in the sense that the cultic rites of temple worship were abolished by Nebuchadnezzar when the temple was destroyed; and was never really restored at all, for the temple of Solomon was an empty edifice in which the Shekinah Presence, or Holy Spirit of the Father and Son could not be found. Instead, the cultic ceremonies of nations such as Babylon were enforced upon Israel, thus obscuring the object of the cultic rites of Israel - the future Messiah, with the rank paganism of Baylon, etc. In the rest of the Old Testament, and particularly the Exile, the prefix `*ta*' is not used, and refers to a sense of continuity in the sense that the `continuity' which is referred to in `*tamid*' represents the continual all-enveloping sense of the removal of the cultic ceremonies peculiar to Israel by paganism, and the corresponding sense of oppression of Israel that is created by the paganism which has enveloped her, as the following verse which is found in Isaiah demonstrates:

`Now therefore, what have I here, saith the LORD, that my people is taken away for nought? they that rule over them make them to howl, saith the LORD; and my name continually *[tamid]* every day is blasphemed.' (Isaiah 52:5)

Another example of this continual *tamid* oppression is found in Isaiah 51: 12-14:

`I, even I, am he that comforts you: who are you, that you should be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass; And forget the LORD your maker, that has stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth; and have feared continually *[tamid]* every day because of

the fury of the oppressor, as if he were ready to destroy? and where is the fury of the oppressor? The captive exile hastens that he may be loosed, and that he should not die in the pit, nor that his bread should fail.' *(Isaiah 51:13-14)*

Lines 7 and 8 of the Cyrus Cylinder gives an example of Nabonidus, the father of Belshazzar in the Book of Daniel doing this very same thing, in his attempt to wipe out the cultus of Marduk, and instituting Bel, instead:

`Irreverently, he put an end to the regular offerings (and) he interfered in the cultic centres; he established in the sacred centres. By his own plan, he did away with the worship of Marduk, the king of the gods, he continually did evil against Marduk's city. Daily, without interruption, he imposed the corvee' upon its inhabitants unrelentingly, ruining them all.'

Daniel's petition of the Lord, and indeed the petition of *all* Jews, was *`How long will this continual (tamid) paganism triumph over thou, O Father? How long shall thy Sanctuary be restored to its rightful place?* ' The answer that was given to Daniel, was *`2,300 days, and then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed.*'

John W. Peters wrote an exegesis of Daniel 8:914 in December 23, 1992, which was revised and corrected in May 2009, in partial fulfillment of a Master of Divinity Degree, at Andrews University, Michigan. The following is an extract of the sections dealing with *`Hattamid: The Daily Identified',* and *`Tamid and Paganism in the Old Testament*' In this thesis, he gives a literal translation of Dan. 8:9-14, as well as *`Hattamid - The "daily" identified, and `Tamid and Paganisim in the Old Testament':*

`4.0 Translation of Daniel 8:9-14

Vs. 9 And out of one of them he (masculine) came, a horn from littleness, which became very great toward the south and toward the east, and toward the glory.

Vs. 10 And it (feminine) became great even to the host of the heavens. And it (fem.) made fall to the ground (some) from the host and (some) from the stars and trampled them.

Vs. 11 Even unto the Prince of the host he (masculine) exalted himself. And from him (mas.) was lifted up the daily (continuance) and the place of his (mas.) sanctuary was cast down.

Vs. 12 It (feminine) was given even a host against the daily by means of transgression. And it (fem.) cast down truth to the ground and it (fem.) worked and it (fem.) prospered.

Vs. 13 Then I heard a certain holy one speaking and another holy one said to that one who spoke, “Until when the vision, the daily and the transgression which desolates making both the sanctuary and the host to be trampled”.

Vs. 14 And he said unto me, “Until 2300 evening-morning, then the sanctuary shall be put right (cleansed)”.

`*5.2.2.3 Hattamid: The Daily Identified*'

Recent Adventist scholarship has concluded that “daily” is associated with the high priestly ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.[40] The pioneers of Seventh-day Adventism until 1900 identified *hattamid* interchangeably as paganism or pagan Rome which evoked virtually no controversy. For example, U. Smith identifies “the daily” in Daniel 8:11 as pagan Rome,[41] but in Daniel 8:13 and 11:31 he identifies “the daily” as paganism.[42] Similarly, William Miller linked “the daily” of Daniel 8:11 with “the restrainer” in 2 Thessalonians 2:7-8 identifying both as paganism which was interchangeable with pagan Rome.[43]

However, a clear distinction must be maintained between the term “pagan Rome” and “paganism.” Pagan Rome is a national power or the exceedingly dreadful beast with teeth of iron (Dn. 7:7, 19). On the other hand, paganism is an “activity” or false religious system in rebellion against God manifested by character attributes of self-exaltation against God. Succinctly stated, “the daily” is a rebellious activity manifesting self-exalting character attributes.

If pagan Rome is represented by the masculine pronoun in the prepositional phrase, “from him (mimmennu) the daily was lifted up,” in verse 11, then “the daily” cannot represent the entity or power of pagan Rome. It is a non sequitur to suggest that pagan Rome is lifted up from pagan Rome. It is suggested that “the daily” must be carefully defined as a principle, namely the self exalting character of paganism, inherent in mankind, of which Arianism became integrated. The “abomination (transgression) which desolates” in Daniel 8, 11 and 12, which supersedes and replaces “the daily,” may be defined as the self exalting character of nominal Christianity of which the papacy became the fountain head. The essence of “the daily” is “the mystery of iniquity” which seeks to become like God (Is. 14:12-14; 2 Thess. 2:3-7). The point of commonality between “the daily” and

the “abomination which desolates” is the “mystery of iniquity.” This character attribute was lifted up by the papal Rome from pagan Rome with the result that the false religious systems (paganism) were replaced or superseded (taken away or turned aside) by nominal Christianity, a new false religious system professing Christ, uncreated, in contrast to Arianism’s created christ. This process commenced in AD 508 when Arian powers under Theodoric made peace with Clovis and the resistance of the Arian powers began to come to an end.[44]

The conclusion stated above that “the daily” is represented by the principle of self exaltation manifested in the character of paganism and inherent in mankind, and the conclusion concerning “the abomination which desolates” will be confirmed as the explication of Daniel 8.

`*5.2.2.4 Tamid and Paganism in the Old Testament*

The expression, *tamid,* occurs 103 times in the OT and is used regularly and without exception either as an adverb or adjective meaning “continually” or “continual” respectively. Only in Dn. 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31 and 12:11 does the word tamid occur as an isolated substantive without adjectival designation, *hattamid,* meaning “the continuance”. Of the 103 occurrences in the OT tamid is used 30 times in connection with several different types of activity of the priests in the sanctuary (Ex. 25:30; 27:20; 29:38; 30:8; etc.). Shea[45] as well as Rodriguez[46] and Hasel[47] all agree that *hattamid* in Daniel refers to the Hebrew cultus of the sanctuary service. This exegesis will confirm that *“the daily”* is a Hebrew cultic term in a later section, but only in a counterfeit cultic sense in the book of Daniel. Consequently, *hattamid* should be understood in its broadest possible sense including its use in a pagan context.

The connection of *hattamid* with *“gadal”* (to become great) and *rum* (lift up) in Dn. 8:11 has its closest parallel in Ps. 74:23, “Do not forget the voice of Your enemies; the tumult of those who rise up against You increases continually (tamid)”. The Hebrew word for rise up is `alah which has the root meaning of “lifted up”, “elevated”, “exalted” or “offer” which is nearly identical to the root meaning of rum and similar to gadal in Dn. 8:11. The continual (tamid) activity of the Lord’s foes (paganism) is to rise up or exalt themselves against Him in Ps. 74:23. The parallel to Dn. 8:11 is extremely close.

Other uses of tamid in a pagan context include Is. 52:4-5 wherein the past oppression of Israel by Egypt and Assyria and Israel’s future captivity is evident and the Lord says “those who rule over them make them wail and My name is

blasphemed every day continually (tamid). Again there is an implicit connection of tamid with exalting against God (blaspheming) similar to Dn. 8:11 and Ps. 74:23. In Obadiah 15-16 there is a clear allusion to the “continual” exalting against God by Edom and other pagan nations on God’s holy mountain. The continual (tamid) wickedness of Assyria in opposition to and rebellion against God is evident in Nahum 3:18-19 (cf. 1:2).

The self-exalting, rejoicing behavior of Babylon by virtue of their world-conquering prowess is decried by Habakkuk in chapter 3:15. The pagan nation ascribes his power to his god (1:11) and worships in a counterfeit cultic setting (1:6) while sacrificing to his net and burning incense to his fishnet. In 1:17 *tamid* is connected with the false cultic worship in self-exalting rebellion against God: “shall he therefore empty his net, and shall he not spare to continually (tamid) slay nations?”

Finally the counterfeit cultic application of tamid by rebellious Israel, exalting against God, is seen in Is. 65:2-3 in which “a people provoke Me to anger continually *(tamid)* who sacrifice in gardens and burn incense on altars of brick”. The continual *(tamid)* exalting against God, associated with pagan nations, has been lifted up and incorporated by God’s professed people of Israel. The parallel to Dn. 8:11 is again unmistakable in which even unto God, pagan Rome magnifies itself and from him *hattamid* (continual self-exalting) is lifted up by papal Rome.

The Biblical evidence clearly reveals counterfeit cultic applications of the Hebrew term “tamid” with the connotation of self-exalting behavior against God. Based on the foregoing discussion, it is suggested that the substantive hattamid represents neither the continual heavenly ministry of Christ nor the nation or power of pagan Rome, but represents the “continual” self-exalting character of paganism inherent within fallen man and which has been manifested in the false religious systems of every pagan nation throughout history. Daniel explicitly attributes this tamid-gadal behavior to Media-Persia, Greece, and Pagan Rome from whom it was “lifted up” (rum) by papal Rome.' *(`The Mystery of the Daily': An Exegesis of Danel 8:9-14, J. Peters, 2009.)*

In the ninth chapter of the Book of Daniel, Daniel prayed his prayer of the hope of forgiveness for his people - and included *himself* as participating in the corporate sins of his people; yet he was spotless in this regard *(Dn. 9: 4-19).* In this, he was a representation of Christ, for although Christ did not partake of the sins of humanity, yet he took all of our sin into Him at Calvary and became the Second Representative Man of the race. Thus, what Adam (the first representative man of

the race) did when he first sinned in Eden, Christ undid at Calvary - when Christ dared to die the `second death' on behalf of fallen man. Thus at the Cross, the `Great Controversy between Christ and Satan' was sharply delineated, for the principle of the continual self-exultation of `*tamid*' paganism was juxtaposed with the self-less principle of the self-abdegnation of Christ, which is represented by the Cross.

The Cross sharply defines the *tamid* principle of self-exultation, by contrasting it with the outpouring of self-less love at the cross. Thus `Eros' is the principle of self-exulation and is represented by the selfish mind which Lucifer first acquired when his heart was first `lifted up because of your beauty'(Ezekiel 28: 17), and `Agape' is represented by the mind of self-abdegnation, and is represented by the selfless mind of Christ (Phil. 2:5). Furthermore, as the Papacy is *also* defined in Dn 8: 11 as being `lifted up' and `exalted' by the very same principle that caused Lucifer's heart to be `lifted up' by his pride of self in his great beauty, thus corrupting his wisdom `by reason of [his] brightness' (Ezekiel 28: 17), so also did this `wine of Babylon' become infused into Protestantism and a right conception of the *true* character of God - `Agape' - became distorted, as conceptions based upon`Eros' became infused into doctrine which eventually came to be regarded as orthodox. For instance, the doctrine of the `natural immortality of the soul' is one of many erroneous doctrines which distort one's perception of the `Agape' of Christ.

Thus Daniel was absolutely horrified when he saw `the abomination which makes desolate' would be `lifted up' from *tamid* paganism, straight into the *professed* Church of God's people, for this `abomination' would so completely distort the knowledge of the true character of God, that His children would be completely desolated by a lack of knowledge of His true character of `Agape'.

The Biblical truth of the true character of God could not be fully recovered and thus comprehended until it was first built upon Biblical truths which had not been recovered during the Reformation, such as a correct understanding of the ontological relationship of the Father, Son and their Holy Spirit; the Sabbath, the conditional immortality of the soul, and of course Messiah in His Sanctuary on the Day of Atonement. Thus in a deeper sense, when Daniel cried our to the Lord to `*shine your face upon your sanctuary that is desolate*' *(Dn. 9:17),* this prayer could not be answered completely, until the end of the *charon* vision of Dn. 8 saw the 2,300 days terminate in 1844 - which then paved the way for a greater understanding of the character of God, and the recovery of the principle of `Agape' in 1844, which began with the recovery of the doctrinal truths outlined above.

Further research into this "*ta hamid*" principle of self-exultation of the `Eros' motif suggests that this `Great Controversy' between Eros and Agape - *which is a contention about the very character of God* - is found in the chiastic structure of the entire book of Daniel, as well as the prophecy of the `Seventy Weeks' of Dn 9, as this prophecy is also chiastic in structure, and relates directly to Dn 8. The phrase `little horn', as found in Dn 7 & 8, while (strictly speaking) may not be chiastic in structure, are instead written respectively in Aramaic and Hebrew. They differ slightly in syntax, with a literal translation of the Aramaic of Dn 7 reading "another horn, (a little one)", and the original Hebrew of Daniel 8 reading "a horn from littleness'; thus indicating that each verse describes different operations of the same power. (For instance, while Dn 7 describes the horizontal operation of the `little horn' power, while Dn 8 mainly describes the vertical operartion of this same power.) Dn 9 is given as an explanation of Dn 8 (for reason that Daniel could not understand the *charon* vision of the 2,300 days of Dn 8), with the central focus of the two books being the chiasm of Dn 9, in which the focal point of the `Seventy Weeks of Daniel' is the first half of verse 26, which states that:

`And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself'

As the phrase `cut off, but not for himself' reveals to us that Christ dared to die the `second death' for us when He was `cut off' from the Father, then the central theme of the chiasms which form the structure of these two books is that of judgement, as found in Daniel chapters 4 and 5 (which form the core of the chiastic structure of the Book of Daniel), the Day of Atonement, as found in Daniel chapter 8, and the remedy for sin - Calvary; where Christ was `cut off, but not for Himself' - where the `Agape' of the Father and Son was poured out to us without measure, on the Cross. This premise will be further expanded upon and explained in a little more detail in a future article which will deal with this.

The research on the chiasms of the Book of Daniel, and in particular Dn 8 & 9 lends further support to the traditional view of "the daily", and further expands upon brother Peter's basic premise, which is summed up by the following statement:

` . . . . "the daily" is represented by the principle of self exultation manifested in the character of paganism and inherent in mankind . . . . [it represents] neither the continual heavenly ministry of Christ nor the nation or power of pagan Rome, but represents the "continual" self-exalting character of paganism inherent within fallen man and which has been manifested in the false religious systems of every pagan nation in history . Daniel explicitly attributes this tamid-gadal behaviour to

Media-Persia, Greece, and Pagan Rome from which it was "lifted up" (rum) by papal Rome.'

This `lifting up' `*rum*' of the continual `*tamid*' paganism into Papal Rome is described in verse 11 of Dn. 8:

`Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him*(from him)* the daily [sacrifice] was taken away [rum], and the place of the sanctuary was cast down.' *(Daniel 8:11)*

As a correct exegisis of `*rum*' is to be lifted up and exalted; strictly speaking the phrase `*was taken away*' is an incorrect translation of the verse, as it conveys the pre-conceived idea of the translator - that the `continual' `*ha tamid*' sacrifice pertains solely to the sacrifice of lambs, `morning and evening'. This is evident by "*ha tamid*" being translated as `the daily [sacrifice]' in Dn 8: 13; when a proper exegesis would simply be "*the continual*".

The `*rum*' `lifting up' of Dn 8: 11 instead relates to a power that Daniel finds far more astounding than the *tamid* paganism of the surrounding nations, for this is the `*abomination that makes desolate*' that was spoken of by our Lord Himself, when He directly refers to the Book of Daniel:

`When all of you therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:) Then let them which be in Judaea flee into the mountains.' *(Matthew 24:15-16)*

Once the *charon* vision of Dn. 8 is clarified in Daniel ch. 9; Daniel is mortified, for then a much worse desolating power comes into view, for it is a Church that is literally `lifted up' by the robes of paganism - yet she professes to be the Bride of Christ Herself. This `lifting up' of paganism into the Church created the `*abomination which makes desolate*' *i.e - the Papacy;* for in a literal translation of the verse, we find that:

`*Vs. 11 `Even unto the Prince of the host he (masculine) exalted himself. And* ***from him*** *(mas.) was lifted up the daily (continuance) and the place of his (mas.) sanctuary was cast down*'.

The phrase `by him' is also a poor translation - a literal translation reads `*from him*'. Thus in Verse 11 we see "the daily" transmogrified into an abomination which is far worse than the `continual' *tamid* paganism which Israel was oppressed by, for it makes desolate any knowledge of Christ ministering to us as our High Priest

in the Heavenly Sanctuary. However, this second phase of the self-exultation of paganism (which is identified as the `lifting up' of paganism into the Church); is not "the daily", as many of the brethren began to believe when Louis Conradi first introduced his `new view' in about 1900. It is instead 'the abominaton of desolation'. As the `new view' confuses the identity of the `the abomination that makes desolate' with the identity of "the daily", it then follows that the `lifting up' of *tamid* paganism into the `abomination that makes desolate' in the second phase of the operation of *tamid* paganism (Dn 8: 11) is also confused.

The `new view' of "the daily" was not and never could be the Papacy obscuring the ministry of our High Priest in heaven, for if this were true, then the `time' of Daniel 8:14 would indicate that the Papacy began in 457 B.C; which is of course ludicrous. Ultimately, the only explanation that this theology *can* give, is that Antiochus Epiphanes IV is made to be a primary interpretation, while the Papacy becomes seen as a secondary interpretation of the `time' of Daniel 8:14.

This interpretation has proved disastrous four our Church, and like Trinitarianism is a canker which is rotting it from the inside out; for if "the daily" is indeed the Papacy, as is commonly believed by over 90% of our pastors today, then precisely *where* do we fix the 2,300 days of Daniel 8:14? The answer is, we can't - which is why one will rarely ever hear a sermon on Daniel & the Revelation, as our people are confused upon this point - I know that I was myself, until relatively recently.

Conradi was probably not the first to imbibe of the `new view' - it is quite likely that this dubious achievement instead belongs to Ballenger, who defected to the Baptists and Dispensationalist theology in 1887, one year before Waggoner and Jones presented their views on `The Two Covenants' at Minneapolis. As Ballenger had defected a year before over his perception of the Sanctuary doctrine - central of which is the Dispensationalist teaching which states that the Old Covenant is of Law, and pertained only to literal Israel until Calvary, at which the New Covenant of Grace then became applied to the Christian church; when the `Two Covenants' were presented by Elders Waggoner and Jones at the Minneapolis Conference, there was a natural reticence to accept this on the part of brethren like Elder Butler who viewed the two men as inexperienced `fledglings'; for he and the more experienced and older brethren believed that the Old Covenant is the Ceremonial Law. Thus there was a fear that the theology which these two young inexperienced men were presenting would derail the Church from `the old landmarks'. What Butler and associated brethren such as Uriah Smith failed to perceive, was that what *they* were teaching was also a form of dispensationalism, albeit from a semi-arian perspective; thus leading to `the example theory' of the atonement, and the

subtle legalism that then ensues. Therefore when `Christ and His Righteousness' was then presented by Waggoner at Minneapolis after the previous presentation of `The Two Covenants' - the more experienced brethren subsequently rejected it.

Once we accepted Trinitarianism, the combination of viewing Antiochus Epiphanes as `the little horn' power of Daniel ch. 8 and the `new view' of the Sanctuary subsequently became lethal, for reason that all of our Church doctrines were beginning to become spiritualized, and a clear distinction between the Father and Son became increasingly blurred, as did our perception of Messiah in His Sanctuary. For instance, in the following text, the modalism of Trinitarianism has confused our identity of `*the Ancient of Days*':

`I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.' *(Daniel 7:21,22)*

Ellen White believed that the S.D.A Church was founded upon an understanding of Daniel 8:11-14. She described it as "*the foundation of our faith*" and "*the central pillar that sustains the structure of our position*" *(Letter 126, 1897.)* Obviously, she perceived that if our Sanctuary doctrine falls, then so does the Church. Our critics agree with her. During the events which led up to Le Roy Froom's capitulation to the Evangelicals, which resulted in the publication of `*Questions on Doctrine*' in the 1950's, Donald Barnhouse reveals that it is upon the Sanctuary doctrine that the S.D.A Church stands - or falls, for that matter:

“You were founded on a lie … Seventh-day Adventism will have to go back into the same position as Mormonism.”

Once the General Conference began to accept Conradi's views, our basis for setting the beginning of the 2,300 days and all of our doctrines which are associated with the Sanctuary message began to implode. Over time, Conradi apostasied completely, as did a host of others; including, unfortunately - Waggoner; who accepted the `new view', repudiated Ellen White and fell into pantheism at about this same time (1900). Then Prescott embraced it - leading to *his* rejection of the Sanctuary doctrine of our pioneers, as did A.G. Daniels, the Conference President - who (according to a conversation which F.C. Gilbert had with Ellen White in 1910), worked feverishly to promote the `new view' - and the idea that true `*Righteousness by Faith*' was first promoted by Martin Luther, and `1888' was merely a re-affirmation of Lutherian `Justification by Faith'; albeit in

the unique context of Seventh-Day Adventism. Sadly, we have been promoting this idea ever since - for while Luther was content to drink his beer and write anathemas against Jews (and I say this with the deepest respect - for where would Protestantim be without him?*), true* `Righteousness by Faith' can only be seen in the context of the Cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary, with Messiah purifying the hearts of his people by His `agape' love. Only then is *true* sinlessness in the `Last Generation' possible, for this is a `faith which *works* by love (agape) (Galatians 5:6). Luther lived prior to the `Investigative Judgment', and had no conception of this.

Once Elder Daniel's had accepted the `New View', his long tenure as General Conference President led to the rot setting in; with the theology of Des Ford as the inevitable result; which then led to thousands of our brightest lights of the 1970's and 80's defecting to what they perceived as greener, non-legalistic pastures.

Such is our history, in relation to our rejection of `the covenants' as presented at Minneapolis, the elevation to Antiochus to the `little horn' of Daniel 8, the `new view' of the Sanctuary, and the desolation of our doctrines which the appropriation of Trinitarianism has caused. We are an anchorless ship adrift on a sea of confusion, with no rudder and no compass to guide us. Unless, of course - we return to that `most precious message' which is to herald `the latter rain'.

However, this fails to answer one basic question, which we have *never* sufficiently addressed as a denomination - how *did* papal Rome come up out of Greece as `a horn out of littleness'**,** (as literal translations informs us), and then `waxed exceedingly great' (Dan. 8:9)? How is this possible, when *pagan Rome* is the fourth kingdom? This is a question which has vexed our scholars for decades. They key to unlocking this text lies in Revelation 13:2:

`And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy***. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard,*** and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.' *(Rev. 13:1-2)*

One of the heads of this beast was wounded to death; yet his deadly wound was healed. This is of course the papacy and is the non-descript beast upon which the apocalyptic `woman' of prophecy sits - upon `*the beast which is like unto a leopard*'.

This is the prophetic `key' which unlocks the puzzle of Daniel 8:9 - a horn that `*grew from littleness*' out of Greece (for a strict translation of the Aramaic of the `little horn of Daniel 8 reads `*a horn from littleness)*, `*waxed exceeding great*', and became the Papacy. For in a deeper level, the underlying principle of "*the daily*" is self-exultation, which became propagated by papal Rome when *tamid* paganism was `lifted up' into papal Rome. In papal Rome, we see the principle of `Eros' then presented to Christians in a modified form - the synthesis of `Eros (as outlined by the Greek philosopher Plato) with `Agape' - with the result being `*Caritas*', or charity. It is also known as *lovingkindness* - which is also closely associated with another Greek word for love, which is known as *phileos,* or `brotherly love'. The American city called `Philadelphia' and the sixth church in Revelation are also derived from this conception of `brotherly love', which is known *phileos.* It may represent a noble form of love - but it does not reach high enough to the dizzying heights of *agape.*

Augustine first attempted a synthesis of this Platonic hybrid of Greek philosophical belief and apostolic Christianity, and it subsequently became the basis of Roman Catholic Theology - beginning with Clement of Alexandria and Origen in the second and third centuries in the Catechetical School of Alexandria, which subjected Scripture to Greek philosophy. The end result of this is seen in these indentical philosophies being embraced in Pope Benedict XVI's `First Encyclical Letter':

`The divine power that Aristotle at the height of Greek philosophy sought to grasp through reflection, is indeed for every being an object of desire and of love —and as the object of love this divinity moves the world—but in itself it lacks nothing and does not love: it is solely the object of love. The one God in whom Israel believes, on the other hand, loves with a personal love. His love, moreover, is an elective love: among all the nations he chooses Israel and loves her—but he does so precisely with a view to healing the whole human race. God loves, and his love may certainly be called *eros*, yet it is also totally *agape*.' *(Pope Benedict XVI, `First Encyclical Letter', 1:9.)*

`*Eros*' might be defined as the `mind of selfishness'; while `*Agape*' might be defined as the mind of selflessness. The principle of Eros was first demonstrated by Lucifer, when in his great pride in himself, he sinned against God.The principle of Agape was demonstrated to us on the Cross, where Christ dared to die `the second death' for us; for while Eros teaches that only the *good* are worth saving, Agape teaches that ` *. . . when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His dear Son*' *(Rom. 5:8).* God loves the unlovable, the very detritus of

humanity.

While Agape is diametrically opposed to Eros, for there can be no Eros, or self-seeking love in Christ; yet Catholic theology teaches that the greatest form of love is a synthesis of the Platonic self-seeking love of Eros, with the selfless love of Agape. Thus in *this* system of belief, Christ is placed so far away from us, that we must go in search of Him to find Him, via a Priest who is another mediator for our sins, for Christ cannot deign to look at us, unless we have a mediator who makes our pleas for forgiveness acceptable to Him. If a Church is to synthesise `agape' with `eros' - as has done the Catholic Church, then to do so is to assume the robe of Plato, the philosopher, while tarting itself up with a smattering of Christianity.

So when we apply all of this to "the daily", we see that the `*tamid*', or `*continual*' represents a basic philosophy - which is that of the self-exaltation of Eros. It first began with the exultation of `self' in the paganism of Babylon (did not Nebuchadnezzar cause all to fall down and worship him under pain of death?), then carried through to Pagan Rome, at which a shift occured with the rise of the Roman Catholic Church, which attempted a synthesism of Eros with Agape, which fulfills the prediction of the the `lifting up' of *tamid* paganism into apostolic Christianity, as outlined by Dn 8: 11. But just as papal Rome has attempted to change `times and laws'; so also did she attempt the impossible in this, for once `agape' is adulterated with `eros', it then reverts back to the *tamid* paganism of Eros - albeit in a much more subtle disguise - a wolf in lamb's clothes. As John Peters noted in his thesis on `*The Mysery of the Daily*':

`The Mystery of Lawlessness and "The Daily"

The character attribute described by the phrase "the mystery of lawlessness" is defined in 2 Thess. 2:4 as exalting oneself above and opposing all that is called God, showing oneself to be God. This self-exalting character attribute was shown to be described by the terms, "the daily" and "the transgression which desolates" in Dn. 8:11-13 in which the later term is equivalent to the "desolating abomination" in 11:31 and 12:11. These terms were directly linked with pagan and papal Rome, respectively, in the exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14.

The evidence from 2 Thessalonians 2 and Daniel 8 leads to the conclusion that "the restrainer" is not directly equivalent to "the daily." However, the two terms are indirectly related. "The restrainer" is pagan Rome symbolized by the horn from littleness in Daniel 8; "the daily" is the mystery of lawlessness which is the character attribute of pagan Rome. The mystery of lawlessness is the all-inclusive

descriptive term for both "the daily" and "the desolating abomination".

The mystery of lawlessness is the outworking principle of Satan which works in all those who refuse to believe the truth, but believe the lie and have pleasure in unrighteousness (2 Thess. 2:12). This principle is described by "the daily" and "the desolating abomination," both of which may now be defined with further clarity. "The daily" is the mystery of lawlessness manifested in the self-exalting character of paganism inherent in mankind of which Arianism became integrated. "The desolating abomination" is the mystery of lawlessness manifested in the self-exalting character of nominal Christianity of which the papacy became the fountain head

Although William Miller in his day did not grasp the full significance of the relationship between "the daily" as the outworking of the principle of the mystery of iniquity in connection with "the restrainer" of 2 Thessalonians 2 in which this principle was embodied, we must credit him with a remarkable breakthrough in understanding. He was the first to discern clearly that "the daily" was an evil thing. For a layman to breakthrough the scholastic confusion of many centuries and take a position as he did in the face of widespread ridicule and opposition was a major accomplishment. This perception enabled him to resist the almost overmastering pressure from his contemporaries who insisted that the "little horn" of Daniel 8 was Antiochus Epiphanes and that the 2300 days were literal and were fulfilled far in the past. Had it not been for his view of "the daily" it is doubtful that the 1844 Movement could have gained the momentum that it did.

Thus his view that "the daily" is paganism was a key element in forming the convictions of those who took part in the Advent Movement. That contribution should be recognized today for what it was--as evidence of the solid leading of the Holy Spirit. This exegesis of "the daily" confirms a conviction that should grow among Seventh-day Adventists worldwide--that God led our pioneers in building a foundation of truth better than they realized.' *(`They Mystery of `The Daily', J. Peters.)*

This `ta hamid' *continuation* of the self exultation of the pagan conception of the love of God continued until 1844, at which the Sanctuary was restored to its rightful place, and the knowledge of `Messiah in His Sanctuary' was restored. It was not until then, that the principal of `Agape' also came to be restored to its rightful place through a restoration of the Sanctuary, and a right knowledge of overcoming sin. Thus, the principle of true `Righteousness by Faith' can only be truly experienced by first comprehending `Messiah in His Sanctuary' pouring out

his `agape' love into our hearts without measure by His Holy Spirit, thus bringing us to perfection, and conformity to the law - by a `faith that *works* by love' (Galatians 5:6.). Against a love such as this, there is no law of condemnation, for it is this Agape love which comprises the character of Christ, and which Lucifer has sought to obscure from our vision for millenia, through the *tamid* paganism of Eros.

REFERENCES:

40. F.B. Holbrook, Ed. DARCOM, Volumes 1-6.

41. Smith, Uriah, Daniel and the Revelation, pp. 159-161.

42. *Ibid,* pp. 165 & 271.

43. *Seventh-Day Adventist Encyclopedia,* p. 367, 1976. See also P.G. Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-Day Adventist Message and Mission,* Berrien Springs: Andrews Univertsity Press, p. 38, 1977.

44. Thomas Hodgkin, *Theodoric, the Goth,* pp. 202, 203: Nugent Robinson, *A History of the World, Vol. I,* pp. 745-79, 81, 82; Richard W. Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages,* pp. 38-39. Quoted in Smith, D & R, p. 328.

45. W.H. Shea, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 514.

46. A.M. Rodrequez, DARCOM: Vol. 2, p. 533.

47. G.G. Hasel, DARCOM: Vol. 2, pp. 404-409.

Original Link:
https://maranathamedia.com/article/view/the-2300-days-of-daniel-and-the-qdailyq